

DRAFT

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

TABLE OF CONTENTS

M.1.0	Initial Screening	1
M.2.0	Basis for Award.....	1
M.2.1	Evaluation Process	1
M.2.1.1	General Criteria Relative to each Factor and Sub factor	1
M.2.2	Eligibility for Award.....	2
M.3.0	Evaluation Factors and Order of Importance.....	3
M.3.1	Volume I - Down Select	4
M.3.1.1	Factor 1: Summary of Relevant Experience.....	4
M.3.1.2	Factor 2: Capabilities Relevant to AIMM	4
M.3.1.3	Factor 3: Experience with Software Development Projects of Similar Size and Complexity	5
M.3.2	Volume II – Section 1: Technical Evaluation Factors	5
M.3.2.1	Factor 1: Approach to Systems Engineering	5
M.3.2.1.1	Sub factor 1.1: Requirements Management	5
M.3.2.1.2	Sub factor 1.2: Allocation of Functions to Builds/Releases.....	5
M.3.2.1.3	Sub factor 1.3: Change Management	6
M.3.2.2	Factor 2: System and Software Architecture.....	6
M.3.2.2.1	Sub factor 2.1: FAA and Industry Data Standards	6
M.3.2.2.2	Sub factor 2.2: Architecture Description.....	6
M.3.2.2.3	Sub factor 2.3: System Interfaces	7
M.3.2.3	Factor 3: Approach to Design & Development of AIMM Capability	7
M.3.2.3.1	Sub factor 3.1: Software Design Approach.....	7
M.3.2.3.2	Sub factor 3.2: Data Integrity/Fusion	7
M.3.2.3.3	Sub factor 3.3: Software Estimation.....	8
M.3.2.4	Factor 4: Test Approach	8
M.3.2.5	Factor 5: Approach to Government Acceptance	8
M.3.3	Volume II – Section 2: Program Management Evaluation Factors	9
M.3.3.1	Factor 1: Management Organization	9
M.3.3.2	Factor 2: Program Staffing	9
M.3.3.3	Factor 3: Management Approach	10
M.3.3.4	Factor 4: Past Performance.....	10

DRAFT

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.3.3.5	Factor 5: Small Business and Small Disadvantaged Business (SBSDB) Subcontracting Plan and Subcontracting Goals	11
M.3.3.5.1	Sub factor 5.1 : SBSDB Evaluation Criteria	11
M.3.4	Volume III - Cost/Contract Documentation Proposal Evaluation Factors ..	11
M.3.5	Volume IV – Oral Presentation.....	11
M.3.5.1	Factor 1: Proposed System and Architecture Overview	12
M.3.5.2	Factor 2: Response to AIM Modernization Challenge Question	12

DRAFT

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Section M – Evaluation Factors for Award

M.1.0 Initial Screening

The Government plans on screening all responses to assure that they are complete and in accordance with all provisions of this Screening Information Request (SIR). Based on the results of this screening, the Government reserves the right to disqualify an Offeror from further consideration when its Proposal is clearly non-responsive to the Government's requirements.

M.2.0 Basis for Award

This acquisition is being conducted in accordance with the FAA Acquisition Management System (AMS). The Government anticipates awarding a single contract for the work defined in this SIR. Award will be made to the Offeror whose Proposal conforms to the requirements of this SIR and provides the best overall value to the Government cost and other factors considered. Best value describes the solution that is the most advantageous to the Government based on the evaluation of technical quality, cost or price, and the other criteria set forth in Section M. The lowest price may not provide the best overall value to the Government. Offerors eliminated at any time during the evaluation process will not have their proposals considered further. The Government reserves the right to make no award in response to this SIR if it deems no proposal represents the best value to the Government estimated costs and other factors considered.

M.2.1 Evaluation Process

During the evaluation process, the Government will evaluate each Offeror's approach to perform the requirements specified in this SIR, as measured by the following:

1. Initial screening of proposals for compliance to the requirements of this SIR
2. Formal evaluation of the Offeror's Volume I Proposal on a PASS/FAIL basis
3. Formal evaluation of the Offeror's Technical/Management Proposal (Volume II)
4. Formal evaluation of the Offeror's Cost/Contract Documentation Proposal (Volume III)
5. Formal evaluation of the Offeror's Oral Presentation (Volume IV)

The following sections define the evaluation criteria for each factor and sub factor. Unless otherwise specified, all sub factors for a given factor are weighted equally.

M.2.1.1 General Criteria Relative to each Factor and Sub factor

Evaluation of Volumes I, II and IV will consider the following general criteria relative to each factor and sub factor:

DRAFT

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1. Strengths and Weaknesses: Strengths and weaknesses of a proposed approach will be identified. Attention will be focused on elements of a proposed approach that are beyond merely satisfying or not satisfying requirements.
 - a) Strengths: That part of a proposal which ultimately represents an added benefit to the Government and is expected to increase the quality of the Offeror's performance.
 - b) Weaknesses: That part of a proposal which detracts from the Offerors ability to meet the Government's requirements or results in inefficient or ineffective performance.
2. Substantiation: The degree to which the Offeror presents analyses or other factual data to justify and demonstrate that a proposed approach will satisfy requirements. Substantiation includes the quality and thoroughness of the information provided to support the response.
3. Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates successful outcome on similar programs and relates this successful outcome to the factors and sub factors, as appropriate.
4. Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates technical expertise in relevant engineering fields necessary for successfully completing the Statement of Work (SOW) requirements.
5. Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an understanding of and documents the risks associated with each technical factor and sub factor. Degree to which the Offeror provides risk mitigation strategies for each risk documented.

The Offeror's responses will be objectively rated based on the evaluation criteria. An overall numerical score will be developed for each Offeror based on a composite score for each factor. An Offeror's strengths and weaknesses will impact the scoring of the factors identified.

M.2.2 Eligibility for Award

To be eligible for award, the Offeror must be determined to be financially viable and otherwise responsible in accordance with the guidelines contained in Section L, paragraph L.10.

The Government reserves the right to award a contract immediately following the conclusion of all evaluations. Therefore, it is critical that each Proposal be fully responsive to this SIR and its provisions.

In evaluating the proposals the Government may conduct written or oral communications with any and/or all Offerors. Additionally, the Government reserves the right to conduct communications and negotiations with any individual competing Offeror, or all competing Offerors, as the situation warrants.

DRAFT

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

If at any point during the evaluation process, the Government concludes that the Offeror does not have a reasonable chance of receiving this award, the Government may eliminate the Offeror from further consideration for award. Any Offeror eliminated from further consideration will be officially notified in writing.

M.3.0 Evaluation Factors and Order of Importance

Volume I will be used for Down Selection, only, and will not factor into final scoring.

Volume II (Technical/Management) is significantly more important than Volume IV (Oral Presentation). Both Volume II (Technical/Management) and IV (Oral Presentation) are more important than Volume III (Cost).

However, as the differences in Volume II (Technical/Management) and Volume IV (Oral Presentation) scores between Offerors decrease, the importance of Volume III (Cost), although not scored, will increase.

Each proposal volume will be evaluated in accordance with the factors and sub factors listed below.

Volume I – Down Selection

Factor 1: Summary of Relevant Experience

Factor 2: Capabilities Relevant to Aeronautical Information Management Modernization (AIMM)

Factor 3: Experience with Software Development Projects of Similar Size and Complexity

Volume II – Section 1: Technical

Factor 1: Approach to Systems Engineering

Sub factor 1.1: Requirements Management

Sub factor 1.2: Allocation of Functions to Builds/Releases

Sub factor 1.3: Change Management

Factor 2: System and Software Architecture

Sub factor 2.1: FAA and Industry Data Standards

Sub factor 2.2: Architecture Description

Sub factor 2.3: System Interfaces

Factor 3: Approach to Design and Development of the AIMM Segment 2 (S2) Capability

Sub factor 3.1: Software Design Approach

Sub factor 3.2: Data Integrity/Fusion

Sub factor 3.3: Software Estimation

Factor 4: Test Approach

Factor 5: Approach to Government Acceptance

DRAFT

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Volume II – Section 2: Program Management

Factor 1: Management Organization

Factor 2: Program Staffing

Factor 3: Management Approach

Factor 4: Past Performance

Factor 5: Small Business and Small Disadvantaged Business (SBSDB) Subcontracting Plan and Subcontracting Goals

Volume III - Cost Proposal

Evaluation Factors do not apply to Volume III.

Volume IV – Oral Presentation

Factor 1: Proposed System and Architecture Overview

Factor 2: Response to AIM Modernization challenge question

M.3.1 Volume I - Down Select

Factors 1, 2 and 3 are of equal importance. All factors will be scored as Pass or Fail.

Offerors will be evaluated on how their proposal addresses the following:

M.3.1.1 Factor 1: Summary of Relevant Experience

1. The Government will evaluate how well the Offeror's past experience can be applied to the experience required for successfully performing against the requirements of the AIMM SOW. Specifically, the Government will examine how similar the cited experience is to the AIMM Program work in terms of size, scope and complexity across the entire life cycle of a program. Offerors whose cited experience is similar to the AIMM program in size, scope and complexity will receive a passing score for this factor.

M.3.1.2 Factor 2: Capabilities Relevant to AIMM

1. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's experience with Aeronautical Information (AI), its generation, use, and maintenance life cycle, and the Offeror's understanding of the application and usage of AI by AIMM Stakeholders. Offerors whose capabilities with AI include its generation, use and maintenance will receive a passing score for this sub factor.
2. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's experience developing systems that use AI. Offerors who have had experience developing at least two systems that use AI will receive a passing score for this sub factor.
3. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's experience with Aeronautical Information Exchange Model (AIXM) and the understanding of its relevance to AIMM. The Government will also evaluate the Offeror's experience in developing and/or

DRAFT

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

maintaining systems that are using AIXM formatted data. Offerors who have demonstrated experience with AIXM, including developing and or maintaining systems that use AIXM data and who demonstrate an understanding of its relevance to AIMM will receive a passing score for this sub factor.

M.3.1.3 Factor 3: Experience with Software Development Projects of Similar Size and Complexity

1. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's experience with developing software projects that are of a similar size and complexity to AIMM S2.
2. The Government will evaluate the maturity and completeness of supporting processes proposed by the Offeror for developing AIMM S2 software, including quality control, risk management, and configuration management processes.

Offerors whose cited software development experience is similar to the AIMM program in size and complexity, and who describe mature and complete processes for developing AIMM S2 software, will receive a passing score for this factor

M.3.2 Volume II – Section 1: Technical Evaluation Factors

The following Evaluation Factors apply to the Offeror's Technical proposal. Factors 2, 3 and 5 are of equal importance and are more important than Factors 1 and 4, which are of equal importance.

M.3.2.1 Factor 1: Approach to Systems Engineering

M.3.2.1.1 Sub factor 1.1: Requirements Management

1. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed approach for allocating AIMM S2 System Specification Document (SSD) requirements ensures detailed requirements are comprehensive, supporting, and consistent with the intent of the AIMM S2 SSD.
2. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed approach for decomposing AIMM S2 SSD requirements ensures detailed requirements are comprehensive and include all SSD requirements.
3. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed approach ensures requirements track from the AIMM S2 SSD to lower level requirements, test and design documentation.

M.3.2.1.2 Sub factor 1.2: Allocation of Functions to Builds/Releases

1. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror proposes a sound approach to allocating functions to releases.

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

2. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror justifies a single or multiple release approach based on how they address their analysis of the benefits, risks, and risk mitigation for the proposed approach.

M.3.2.1.3 Sub factor 1.3: Change Management

1. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed approach for Change Management includes provisions for efficient resolution of change requests, government interaction and cost/risk identification.
2. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed approach to Change Management includes provisions for tracking resulting changes to requirements.
3. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror proposes an integrated approach to change management.

M.3.2.2 Factor 2: System and Software Architecture

M.3.2.2.1 Sub factor 2.1: FAA and Industry Data Standards

1. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an understanding and use of Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC) standards.
2. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an understanding of System Wide Information Management (SWIM) standards required for developing AIMM services that are SWIM compliant.
3. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an understanding of legacy AIM systems relevant to AIMM S2 services.
4. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an understanding of data exchange standards relevant to AIMM S2 services.

M.3.2.2.2 Sub factor 2.2: Architecture Description

1. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror demonstrates a process for evaluating alternatives to determine the optimal AIMM architecture.
2. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the proposed design provides a modular and/or reusable AIMM architecture.
3. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the proposed AIMM architecture supports evolution and integration through open and well defined interface standards.
4. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed AIMM architecture demonstrates flexibility to allow modifications and updates to system

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

design with minimal impact to system operations and support future requirements as the concept of operations matures.

M.3.2.2.3 Sub factor 2.3: System Interfaces

1. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an understanding of legacy FAA AIMM system interface requirements.
2. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed AIMM architecture demonstrates flexibility and adaptability to evolve and support interfaces with additional FAA legacy systems.
3. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed AIMM architecture demonstrates flexibility and adaptability to evolve and support interfaces with future NAS systems.

M.3.2.3 Factor 3: Approach to Design and Development of the AIMM Capability

M.3.2.3.1 Sub factor 3.1: Software Design Approach

1. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed processes for decomposition and allocation of AIMM requirements to commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) software, newly developed code, prototype software, and/or modified existing code. Specifically, the Government will evaluate the Offeror's processes to ensure they are mature, repeatable, and that requirements are sufficiently decomposed for the allocation to be unambiguous.
2. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed processes for decomposition and allocation of AIMM requirements to specific Computer Software Configuration Items (CSCIs). The Government will evaluate the processes for their maturity and ability to ensure the allocation to and definition of CSCIs minimizes technical and cost risk over the lifetime of the AIMM system.
3. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed approach demonstrates a process for the allocation of AIMM performance requirements to system elements that ensures all performance requirements can be verified during system test.

M.3.2.3.2 Sub factor 3.2: Data Integrity/Fusion

1. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed approach for ensuring data integrity and quality, from ingestion of authoritative source data to delivery of the data products to consumers, to ensure the proposed approach does not result in the degradation of any data or negatively impact system performance.
2. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed approach demonstrates a process for applying data fusion to integrate AI, and the degree to

which the Offeror identifies and addresses the challenges of fusing data from the multiple sources of data identified in the AIMM SSD (provided as Attachment J).

M.3.2.3.3 Sub factor 3.3: Software Estimation

1. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed approach ensures completeness of Source Lines of Code (SLOC) estimates to include all AIMM S2 services and major elements of the proposed AIMM architecture.
2. The Government will evaluate the realism and completeness of the Offeror's justification for SLOC estimates, based on the Offeror's description of his estimating process and the Offeror's past experience developing SLOC estimates.
3. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed approach to risk identification and risk mitigation for any planned COTS use, based on the thoroughness of the approach, to include specific risks identified by the Offeror in his proposal and description of how those risks would be monitored over the system's life cycle.

M.3.2.4 Factor 4: Test Approach

1. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's informal test approach is planned to minimize the occurrence of software defects during Formal Testing.
2. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's formal test approach is planned to ensure all Security, Safety, Human Factors, and Performance requirements are met. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's test approach will verify as many AIMM S2 SSD requirements as possible.
3. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed approach includes the appropriate use of Government Furnished Equipment/Government Furnished Information (GFE/GFI) and demonstrates a thorough approach for testing the external, NAS, AIM and internal Aeronautical Common Service (ACS) interfaces identified in the AIMM S2 SSD.
4. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror describes a thorough approach to ensuring the operational suitability of the developed system.

M.3.2.5 Factor 5: Approach to Government Acceptance

1. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's approach to Government Acceptance (GA) will verify all requirements allocated to COTS and/or to non-developmental item (NDI) used in the system, and that there is an effective approach to maintenance of any COTS and/or NDI products used.
2. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's planned approach to GA ensures all necessary artifacts identified in the Statement of Work are completed

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

and delivered against one consistent baseline, to ensure the Government has all necessary materials for Government conducted testing and maintenance of the system.

M.3.3 Volume II – Section 2: Program Management Evaluation Factors

The following Evaluation Factors apply to the Offeror's Management proposal. Factors 1, 2, 3 and 4 are of equal importance. Factor 5 will be rated either Acceptable or Unacceptable by the CO.

M.3.3.1 Factor 1: Management Organization

1. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed program approach demonstrates leadership, team composition and supporting processes required to manage and execute all activities described in the SIR.
2. The Government will evaluate the degree to which lines of communication and escalation procedures provide confidence that program status, issues, and risks will be effectively identified, communicated, addressed, and resolved.
3. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the proposed process for lines of communication and issue-escalation addresses the needs of internal, external and other program stakeholders.
4. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror demonstrates processes for the management of all entities, teammates and subcontractors within the proposed organization.
5. The Government will evaluate the completeness of the Offeror's approach for managing Subcontractors.

M.3.3.2 Factor 2: Program Staffing

The Government will evaluate the degree to which the proposed Staffing Plan provides confidence that the staff categories and effort levels proposed are appropriate in the phases assigned.

1. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror possesses sufficient depth of experienced resources (including subcontractors), beyond those cited as key personnel, required to successfully complete the program.
2. The Government will evaluate the degree to which non-key resources are experienced in the technologies, methodologies, and development approach proposed by the Offeror.

DRAFT

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

3. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the qualifications (experience, education, and certifications) of proposed key personnel demonstrate the knowledge and experience needed to successfully fill prescribed key personnel roles.
4. The Government will evaluate the degree to which skills and experience of proposed key personnel align with the skills and experience required by the Offeror's proposed design and approach.

M.3.3.3 Factor 3: Management Approach

1. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the proposed management processes, tools, and techniques provide confidence that the Offeror will effectively and efficiently plan, execute, monitor, and control its efforts and the efforts of all subcontractors to meet contractual requirements and assure quality in a timely and cost effective manner.
2. The Government will evaluate the degree to which proposed tools will automate activities and minimize errors.
3. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the proposed processes provide confidence that potential changes to the project baseline will be identified early and appropriate mechanisms will be utilized to correct variances and control changes.
4. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror demonstrates experience and success using EIA-748.
5. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the proposed approach provides confidence that cost and schedule progress will be accurately measured, that cost and schedule variances will be identified in a timely manner, and that adequate linkage exists with other components of the management process to implement effective corrective actions and process improvements.
6. The Government will evaluate the degree to which subcontractors are integrated into the proposed EVM approach.
7. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the proposed risk management approach provides confidence that relevant risks will be identified, prioritized, and mitigated throughout the life of the project.
8. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the initial list of AIMM risks and corresponding mitigation strategies provides confidence that the Offeror will successfully identify and manage risk in order to meet overall program requirements.

M.3.3.4 Factor 4: Past Performance

1. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror demonstrates successful performance with other projects similar to the AIMM effort in size, scope and complexity. Successful past performance will be evaluated based on the Offeror's

DRAFT

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

written response as well as on input from individuals and organizations familiar with the work efforts, products and schedule and cost performance of each Offeror, as demonstrated through previous or ongoing contracts of a similar size, scope and complexity. The Government reserves the right to contact prior clients of the Offeror, subcontractors and consultants, including references other than those identified by the Offeror, and to use those results in this evaluation.

M.3.3.5 Factor 5: Small Business and Small Disadvantaged Business (SBSDB) Subcontracting Plan and Subcontracting Goals

1. Offerors are hereby notified that the adequacy of a SBSDB Subcontracting Plan is a factor in the Contracting Officer's determination of prospective Contractor responsibility as provided in Section L.10. If the apparently successful Offeror fails to propose the required subcontracting goals, that Offeror shall be ineligible for award.
2. This factor is not applicable to small businesses; therefore, all small and small disadvantaged businesses will receive an acceptable rating for this factor.

M.3.3.5.1 Sub factor 5.1: SBSDB Evaluation Criteria

The subcontracting plan will be rated by the CO as either Acceptable or Unacceptable and will not be numerically scored. The evaluation factors will be assigned an adjectival rating as follows:

1. **ACCEPTABLE**– Proposed goals meet or exceed SIR-established subcontracting goals.
2. **UNACCEPTABLE** - Offeror fails to propose goals, or proposed goals do not meet SIR-established subcontracting goals.

M.3.4 Volume III - Cost/Contract Documentation Proposal Evaluation Factors

The Government will evaluate Cost/Contract Documentation proposals to determine whether the proposed costs and prices are reasonable and realistic; also, that it is, neither significantly overstated nor significantly understated relative to what the Offeror can reasonably be expected to incur during contract performance. The Government reserves the right to adjust the proposed costs if it determines that they are unrealistic.

The Government also reserves the right to conclude that unrealistically high or low proposed costs are indicative of the Offerors lack of understanding of the Government's requirements.

M.3.5 Volume IV – Oral Presentation

Volume IV will be evaluated based on Offeror's response to Factors 1 and 2 which are of equal importance.

DRAFT

PART IV – SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.3.5.1 Factor 1: Proposed System and Architecture Overview

1. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's proposed architecture meets requirements of the AIMM S2 SSD, including security, flexibility, ability to move AIMM services to a cloud computing environment, and performance, with minimum implementation risk.
2. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Contractor substantiates the estimated SLOC for the AIMM S2 capability and clearly relates that SLOC estimate to the proposed architecture elements.
3. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Contractor identifies requirements to be met with COTS or NDI products (if any) and demonstrates the ability of those products to meet those allocated requirements (if any).

M.3.5.2 Factor 2: Response to AIM Modernization Challenge Question

The Challenge question and evaluation criteria will be provided in accordance with the schedule provided in Section L.15.